UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Humanism and the Community Church

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The Unholy Crusade Against Russia

By WALTER WALSH

We Believe in Prayer

A Symposium

The Quest of the Ages

A Book Review

By M. C. OTTO

VOLUME CV NUMBER 5

Chicago, March 31, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes

Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 67
Humanism and the Community Church..... 69
Jottings—J. H. H..... 71

ARTICLES—

The Unholy Crusade Against Russia—WALTER WALSH 71
We Believe in Prayer—A Symposium..... 74

POETRY—

The Heart of Music—H. H. LEWIS..... 76
Trumpets on Far Horizons?..... 77

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Quest of the Ages—M. C. OTTO..... 77

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Swift-Changing Scene in Russia—SYDNEY STRONG 78
A Correction—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL..... 78
A Tour to Russia—NORMAN THOMAS..... 78
Co-operation for Security—LUCIA AMES MEAD 79

THE FIELD—

Friendship Exhibits from Mexican Children... 79
Youth in World Peace Prize Competition..... 79
Russian Persecution 79
The Church in the Changing City—*From the Detroit Conference* 79
The Campaign Against Drink in India..... 79

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1930 NUMBER 5

A PROPHECY COMING TRUE

1st July 1856.—A man, and still more a woman, always betrays something of his or her nationality. The women of Russia, for instance, like the lakes and rivers of their native country, seem to be subject to sudden and prolonged fits of torpor. In their movements, undulating and caressing like that of water, there is always a threat of unforeseen frost. The high latitude, the difficulty of life, the inflexibilty of their autocratic regime, the heavy and mournful sky, the inexorable climate, all these harsh fatalities have left their mark upon the Moscovite race.—A certain sombre obstinacy, a kind of primitive ferocity, a foundation of savage harshness which, under the influence of circumstances, might become implacable and pitiless; a cold strength, and indomitable power of resolution which would rather wreck the whole world than yield,—the indestructible instinct of the barbarian tribe, perceptible in the half-civilized nation,—all these traits are visible to an attentive eye, even in the harmless extravagances and caprices of a young woman of this powerful race. Even in their badinage they betray something of that fierce and rigid nationality which burns its own towns and (as Napoleon said) keeps battalions of dead soldiers on their feet.

What terrible rulers the Russians would be if ever they should spread the night of their rule over the countries of the south! They would bring us a polar despotism,—tyranny such as the world has never known, silent as darkness, rigid as ice, insensible as bronze, decked with an outer amiability and glittering with the brilliancy of snow,—a slavery without compensation or relief. Probably, however, they will gradually lose both the virtues and the defects of their semi-barbarism. The centuries as they pass will ripen these sons of the north, and *they will enter into the concert of peoples in some other capacity than as a menace or a dissonance. They have only to transform their hardness into strength, their cunning into grace, their Muscovitism into humanity, to win love instead of inspiring aversion or fear.*

Amiel's Journal.

"Consistency—thou art a jewel." And a paste jewel at that! Emerson's famous statement that "consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds" still stands to us as the wisest word ever spoken upon the subject. It shows better than any other statement of which we know that strange union of practical wisdom with mystical vision, of hard, common-sense realism with exalted, spiritual idealism, which characterized the essential genius of the Concord sage. For who can be consistent in an inconsistent world? Emerson himself tried it, and, to the vast scandal of his friend, Thoreau, gave it up. Tolstoy, a hardier soul than Emerson, gave all the latter and heroic portion of his life to it, and only succeeded in tying himself up into such a tangle of ethical confusions that the world has long since despaired of ever loosing it. Gandhi, an infinitely more patient and gracious spirit than Tolstoy, lives nearer to the ideal of his teaching than any man whom we have ever known or heard of, but the Mahatma is himself the first to point out the contradictions of his career. The fact is, we do not live in a vacuum, and are thus quite unable to be and do the thing we would. The price of survival is adaptation, spiritual as well as physical, and adaptation means an adjustment of the inner life which is dictated by the outer environment. If we would be *in* the world at all, we must to a mortifying extent be *of* the world. As well expect the soul to function without the flesh, as our lives to function without the machinery of social relationships and contacts which is given to us, willy-nilly, by our age. Of course, there are standards which we can never compromise, ideals which we must never betray. There are times when it is not necessary nor even decent to survive, and we fling away our careers as gladly as the martyr flings away his body. But anybody who thinks he can live a perfect life in an imperfect world, do justly in an essentially unjust society, is doomed sooner or later to bitter disappointment. And, after all, our task is not to live a perfect life, but to be useful. Consistency, like clean hands and polished finger-nails, may be a thing of shame in a world where men should work.

Since writing the above, we have received the February 13th issue of *Young India,* in which, as it happens, Gandhi discusses this very question of consistency. With that keen sense of humor which is one of his most delightful qualities, Gandhi quotes the famous maxim of Emerson, and applying it to the inconsistencies charged against him by some of his enemies and even friends, he says, "I must admit my inconsistencies. But since I am called 'Mahatma,' I might well endorse Emerson's saying." He points out the difficulties in the present situation in India. He has proclaimed his acceptance of the cause of national independence, and thus his repudiation of allegiance to the King. Yet, he adds, "when I use a postage stamp or a coin bearing the King's portrait, I seem to belie my profession of independence. When I obey a policeman's instructions, or pay taxes, I ac-

knowledge the King's authority. . . . How am I to solve the problem?" How, indeed? We remember how these questions pressed upon the pacifists in this country when the Great War came upon us in 1917. We were opposed to the war, and therefore could not give any support to the government in the prosecution of the war. We would not fight; we would not buy Liberty Bonds; some of us would not even contribute to the Red Cross. Yet every time we purchased a postage stamp for three cents, we were contributing one cent to the war. Every time we paid our tax bill, we were helping to build battleships and submarines. Every time we were saying nothing, instead of denouncing the fighting, we were offering the silence that gives consent. There was no way to get out of the war altogether, to be consistently pacifist, except to jump off the bridge. But this would have been desertion. In his present plight, Gandhi seeks a better way. This is "to withdraw all such voluntary co-operation as it is possible for me to withdraw, and as is calculated to diminish the prestige and the authority of that (the King's) rule." *Be as consistent with your ideal as you can without loss of effectiveness!* Gandhi seems to sum it all up, when he says, "There is, I fancy, a method in my inconsistencies. In my opinion there is a consistency running through my seeming inconsistencies, as in nature there is a unity running through seeming diversity."

Propaganda in the "movies" is one of the most insidious perils of contemporary life. It has become a greatly increased peril since "talkies" were added to "movies." The damage that can be done to the public mind, and the evil forces that can be released in the world, by this agency when manipulated and controlled to selfish ends, is beyond all calculation. For example! On a certain afternoon not so long ago, there was a disastrous Communist riot in New York City. The morning newspapers on the next day displayed enormous eight-column headlines describing the great Communist gathering in Union Square and the resulting fight between the agitators and the police. That afternoon a friend of ours went into a big "movie" theatre, which was crowded with people. In the News Reel feature, pictures were shown of huge gatherings of people in India listening to native orators as they plead the cause of national independence, raising the new national flag in token of the revolt of Indians from British rule, etc. The pictures were vivid and informing snapshots of the most momentous event of modern times—the struggle of a great people for the boon of liberty! In connection with the scenes upon the screen, there spoke a voice describing these scenes. And what did the "talkie" say? That these pictures showed Communist uprisings in India! —that this flag which was flying against the sky was the red flag!!—that Moscow seditionists were at work in the East exactly as in the West!!! That this ridiculous and inflammatory misinformaation was passed out to an ignorant audience on the afternoon following a Communist riot which terrified the city, was undoubtedly an accident. That this misinformation was prepared in a "talkie" laboratory and presented in a "talkie" theatre was *not* an accident. It was a deliberate and wicked attempt to mislead the American people about the real character and significance of the Indian revolution, comparable in every sense with the highly successful attempts of the same kind to mislead the American people about the Great War. When one stops to consider that this "talkie-movie" will be shown to fifty or sixty million people before it is done, one can imagine if not exactly estimate the magnitude of this danger.

The raging excitement over Russia seems like the sudden recurrence of a pestilence. A winter or so ago we had a return of the "flu" which we had imagined had taken its toll in 1917-1918 and then disappeared. So now we are unexpectedly in the midst of an eruption of conservative opinion against the Soviets which is like nothing that we have had since 1921-1923. For, of course, the fierce attack on the religious issue is occasioned at bottom by no change in a policy which the Russian government has been consistently following ever since it gained the seats of power. It is a mere excuse for an explosion of madness and fear against a Communist nation which seems not only to be holding its own in the face of the unitedly hostile world, but actually to be making progress against this world. For the five-year drive for consolidation of Communist power within the borders of Russia is proving to be terrifyingly successful. Its first year has reached its goal, and its second is well on the way. Not merely the Communist Party, but the Russian people as a whole are buckling themselves down to a gigantic task of labor and sacrifice with a discipline such as no other country has ever attained except under the drive of war. There are opponents of the policy, of course—the priests, the *kulaks,* the forlorn remnants of the bourgeoise—and these are suffering. But they count for little. The masses in city and country, with stolid determination if not with wild enthusiasm, are backing up the government. And this means progress toward the success of a program which involves a greater threat to capitalistic civilization than anything that German imperial power, in the eyes of its wildest enemies, ever offered against the world. Slowly the significance of what is going on in Russia is sinking into western minds, and the old terror stirs again. The propaganda machines, laid up these many years, are now being put into commission. Today we hear of religious

persecutions; tomorrow it will be the hoary yarn of the nationalization of women. It's an old game, and, whatever the incidental tragedies of the Bolshevik regime, ought not to fool us again.

A new planet has been discovered. This is what we call news! Not that there are not plenty of planets. If we are not satisfied with those in our own solar system, we can move to the system beyond, and find others to enrich our store. One more planet in the heavens is no more important than one more hunk of coal in the bin. But the discovery of a new planet is a new victory for the human mind, and a new vindication of modern science. Especially when it is made under conditions so exactly duplicating those which attached to the famous discovery of Neptune! It will be remembered that the great Herschel declared that a planet must be located in a certain dark spot in the sky, because not otherwise could he explain the observed irregularities in the orbits of other planets. Something was pulling these planets—there was a gravitational influence exerted from a certain point which seemed to be absolutely void. Some time later, at just the point indicated by Herschel, Neptune was suddenly discovered. In the same way, Professor Percival Lowell, of the Lowell Observatory in Arizona, noted years ago certain perturbations in the movements of this very planet, Neptune. He could not explain these except on the basis of the hypothesis that there was somewhere an undiscovered planet exercising a gravitational attraction upon Neptune. He charted this area of the skies, and located the spot where this unseen planet should be. But there was nothing there to be seen! Lowell died in 1916, with his theory unshaken. And now, fourteen years later, the little ray of light is observed at just the point prephesied. This is the sort of event which thrills us to the core of our being. Such an achievement gives a new dignity to man, a new assurance of man's mastery of life, a new potency and beauty to man's inner being. It is an experience worth living for. We wish we could see this planet. We know that we should feel more like praying before it than before any altar in any church in all the world. For in such an object is the true shrine of devotion.

The passing of Mary E. Wilkins, dead on March 14th, saddens us. It brings back the memory of the day, years ago, when we met her. We were a young boy, already touched by the magic of literature. We were reading her short stories as they came out in *Harper's,* and were wildly enthusiastic over these classic depictions of New England rural life. Friends arranged for us to meet her, and we can recall as though it were yesterday Miss Wilkins' soft beauty, her quiet grace, and her tender sympathy for the awe-struck youth. We read all her writings in those days, and have read them on occasion since. What stories they were, and are—"A Humble Romance," "The Village Singer," "A New England Nun," "The Revolt of 'Mother' "! Miss Wilkins' novels were never rated so high by the critics as her short stories, but "Jane Field" presented an unforgettable type of New England character and "Pembroke" was a book of poignant power and beauty. Mary E. Wilkins, like her great rival, Sarah Orne Jewett, caught the life of a distinctive people in a peculiar and socially important area of the country, and immortalized it in her tales of love and death. For we believe that the best of her work is destined to endure. Her volumes, with their vivid pictures of New England farm-houses and churches, New England housewives and spinsters, New England principles and folk-ways, constitute a native literature in the best sense of the word. Curious, with such an author still living among us, that we should have asked in these recent years for the creation of a distinctively American art in the field of letters! Miss Wilkins' days were unsophisticated, and her stories simple. But there was beauty as well as hardness in the world of which she wrote, and she saw deeper into the hearts of humankind than the absence of psychology and "sex stuff" in her work would seem, to our contemporaries at least, to allow. In the best of the stories of this gentle woman and sensitive artist, we see an American literature of which the future will be proud.

Humanism and the Community Church

The two most influential movements within the church in America during the last two or three decades have been the community church which began about fifteen or twenty years ago, and the Humanist Religion which has developed more recently within the last five or ten years.

The growth of the first of these two movements has been almost if not quite phenomenal, for there are now in this country something like seven hundred churches which claim the title "community"; a record of growth which would be hard to match throughout the whole history of ecclesiasticsm in any country. The churches which bear this name are not standardized, and possibly one would not recognize another as belonging to the fold, but the use of the name alone is tribute to the underlying idea. They are all a part of the movement away from sectarianism toward a broader basis of fellowship and service. Even if some of them have not yet loosed the bands of denomina-

tional control, they are making a wide appeal and are reaching toward a control by the whole community.

Humanism is a confusing word, for it has been used to describe so many things, but we can rather clearly discern two phases, both of which greatly concern the church and both of which are making a profound impression on all ecclestiastical thinking. One of these phases might be called "ecclesiastical humanism," the kind of movement which is going on in some Unitarian churches, notably in the west, and is represented by such men as Dietrich and Slaten. The chief ideal of this movement, if we are correct in interpreting it, is its attitude of impatience with the speculative dogma of the past, and its desire to found the church on the solid rock of service to man, a service which can be tested in the crucible of sure reality, and does not depend upon the sanction of some very questionable metaphysic. Such a humanism, therefore, rejects the older supernaturalism and theism, and philosophy of prayers, while it throws its whole strength into making human life better in ways of which we can be sure.

The other type of humanism is more difficult to define, and its place within the church is much less clear, but it may be called for want of a better word "philosophical humanism." This movement tends to reduce religious verities to the level of experience and value. Instead of God being the ultimate reality creating and making man—He becomes a consequence and result. Ethics are, therefore, dependent on man's resources and not upon some eternal "law" or mandate.

These two forms of humanism are apt to go together though not necessarily so, but whether separate or combined they form one of the outstanding influences of modern church life and thought. They are more debated than any other movement and even magazines of general interest, such as Harper's, run articles upon the subject—a remarkable indication of the place which Humanism has in modern life.

The question now is —what relation is there between these two modern influential movements? Should they unite? Should the community church take over Humanism as its gospel, its inwardness and motivating power? And should Humanism take over the Community Church as its vehicle, its mechanism, rather than trying to force its way into the older denominational churches? Such questions are of profound interest to all who are concerned with the modern life of religion, and with the way in which religion is organizing in the new age.

The answer of the writer to these questions is: No. The genius of the two movements is essentially different and, therefore, each should develop its own special history. The two movements should most assuredly not become hostile. Their very names, if nothing more, should prevent any such sad eventuality. Any church that is as broad as the Community must surely be glad to enfold humanism, and any true humanism, worthy the name, must be willing to cooperate with a church which takes the whole community as its field, and the help of all people as its high goal. But the two movements must still go their divergent ways.

Examine for a moment the differences. In the first place, ecclesiastical humanism would rule out what to many people is absolutely essential, namely, the whole field of the metaphysical. Nearly every one must confess that the results of metaphysical speculation have been disappointing and inconclusive. The nature of reality still seems to elude and allure, after all, the centuries of endeavor to unlock the nature of the ultimate. But we are intelligent beings, and we must ever be tortured by the desire to grapple with the problem. Can we simply ignore that whole field of life? Can we push it into the limbo of superstition as futility and still appeal to a true humanity? Most assuredly not. The struggle to understand the universe must go on apace. It will always fascinate. People will always hear metaphysics gladly, because some working philosophy about the nature of the universe is what every one wants as a basis for his outlook on life. Ecclesiastical humanism cramps the freedom and range of the church, although all modern people can easily sympathize with its insistent emphasis upon service to human kind.

And philosophical humanism—what shall we say of that? In so far as it is a closed system, a definitely marked off method, it is merely a new sect, and as such becomes inconsistent with the Community church, indeed. If we have learned anything at all about the history of sectarian schools, it is the fact that they "have their day and cease to be," and there is no reason to suppose that philosophical humanism will escape this common fate. As a brave attempt at truth it should be welcomed; as a method substituting experimentation for mere speculation it should have its fair chance for sympathetic consideration. But if it becomes an exclusive movement it will be a sect, and whatever is "cut off from" is diametrically opposed to the idea of community church which is synthetic and eclectic.

The more the writer studies the problem of the church in relation to modern life, the more he is convinced that ecclestiastical organizations must be inclusive rather than exclusive, ecclectic rather than sectarian, that they must unite in a "brotherly search for truth" rather than in claiming a final or particular method and that they must try to grapple with problems of ultimate reality; but that such grappling shall not erect barriers of creed or dogma against any who are desirous of partaking in the adventure after the larger life. CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

Long, long ago, man prostrated himself before idols. Then he bowed before kings. Now he salutes a flag.

Every now and then we remember what the Russian Church used to be in the land of the Tsar. Then we marvel that there are any churches left at all in Russia, and praise the moderation of the Soviets.

Gandhi begins the Indian Revolution with an attack upon the salt tax. This seems a trivial issue. But it reminds us that our forefathers began the American Revolution with an attack upon the tea tax.

Roman Catholics, during this Lenten season, may eat candy. If they gave it up as usual, says the Church, it would cause unemployment and thus aggravate the present bad industrial situation. But, by the same token, why give up anything in Lent? Why not go to theatres and dances? And why not eat meat on Fridays? Think of how the packing industry would boom if all Catholics stopped the Friday fasting! If "logic is logic," let us all sin, and thus give somebody work.

Dr. Eugene Christian, New York diet specialist, died recently a martyr to his faith. He preferred to die rather than to stop eating spinach. Curious! Most of us would prefer to die rather than to begin eating spinach.

It seems to be as hard to name a new planet as to name a new baby.

J. H. H.

The (Un)holy Crusade Against Russia

What are we to think of the Christian Crusade against Russia?

To begin with, we need be under no delusion as to the desire and intention of the Soviet government to extirparte religion root and branch from the Soviet dominions (if it can). It has taken over the avowed policy of Lenin. Examine that for a few moments.

The whole governmental tradition of Russia is soaked in terrorism, and Lenin accepted the heritage, having suffered under it, applying it also to religion which he declared to be: "opium for the people." We cannot deny that "opium" is not too harsh a word for a large percentage of churchmanship, and we cannot blame his successors for adopting his words as a maxim of policy. Where we differ from them is with regard to the means they adopt to counteract the opium. As a Russian and a Terroist Lenin knew but one way. He desired a completely materialized, completely mechanized, Russia, enfeebled by no visions of future bliss, and distracted by no spiritual agitations. God must be overthrown, and to that end he set on foot a regular atheistic propaganda, now carried on by "The Society of the Godless," which, though still outnumbered by believers or church members, is said to be growing numerically.

Here I must cry "Beware!" Truth forbids us to bear false witness against our neighbor. It is so long since 1914 that we have forgotten the lying and slandering campaign carried on against Germany—openly admitted now that it has served its purpose—in order to infuriate us for war? Let our judgment not be clouded by dark hints and winks, innuendoes and stage-whisper suggestions, theatrical declamation, allegations undated and unproved; for these are stuff of the devil's own brew. Before we shout "guilty!" let us have the *facts*, let us like patient jurymen weigh them *pro* and *con*, and let us not fail to listen to the accused in his own defense. What was called murder may turn out to have been at the worst manslaughter, what was called manslaughter may prove to have been pure accident, and what was called accident may come out as pure newspaper myth and never have occurred at all. Rumor is a lying jade. Political prejudice has committed perjury before today. And religious bigotry before today has shed innocent blood.

In any mention of persecution of the Greek Orthodox Church it is only fair to remember that the Church itself was a bitter persecutor in the day of its power. It was the willing tool of the bloody Tzardom. Let Jews, Stundists, Dukhobors, stand up and testify. Turn back and read Tolstoy's terrible indictment of "The Hanging Tzar." Unhappily, as Tolstoy foresaw and lamented, the Russian revolutionary movement was taking the same road as the Tzardom—the road of violence, the end of which for it also would be destruction. It may be that the Soviet government is not responsible for every separate act of the Anti-god Society, but there can be no doubt of its completely atheistical motive. The Supreme Council has dropped "religious freedom" from its constitution. The decree runs thus: "There shall be freedom of conscience and freedom of anti-religious propaganda." Freedom of *pro*-religious propaganda is dropped out. This may be lamentable, but it does not amount to persecution. It is restriction, it is curtailment, it is partial impotence, it is a sort of smothering process, but it is not positive cruelty, not atrocity, not martyrdom.

The principle of justice requires us also to look behind the clamour of the ecclesiastics and their allies, and to ask whether, as *The Manchester Guardian* (among others) suspects, it has not some political motive and object. There are still political backwoodsmen who would break with Russia, war with Russia, for no higher reason than that it is a proletarian Republic. As for the Pope, the head of the Greek Church has publicly accused him of conspiring for the profit and advancement of the Church of Rome as against the Greek Church in Poland as well as in Russia. Let the ecclesiastics fight that battle

out between them. If we are misled into picking Romish chestnuts out of the fire, we shall get our fingers burned. There is no clear evidence of positive injury to individual priests or preachers in Russia. The severe restrictions to which they are subject no doubt bear hardly on them in the very degree in which they are sincere and earnest Christians, Jews, or Dissenters. In that they all deserve our sympathy. And we reprobate and denounce every law that fetters religious freedom whether in England or in Russia. We cannot forget that we have such laws yet in England also; and that they were at one time operated far more severely than they are in Russia at the present time. The law in Russia may be severe—to my mind it is the negation of freedom—but we have no reason to believe that those priests and ministers and rabbis who keep the law are punished or oppressed. If they plot against the government, then they come up against civil law, and are naturally imprisoned, banished, or otherwise punished as the law lays down. It is so in this and every country. Surely if a cleric breaks the law he becomes subject to law's penalties. You would not have your priests and clerics put above and beyond law would you? Then if you talked of "persecution" you would be silly.

Come back to the question of *Freedom*. While in this country the Anglican church is still in bondage to the State, and while the Greek church under the Tzars enjoyed the patronage and protection of the State, the Bolshevik State immediately did two meritorious things which many Nonconformists have for generations been vainly trying to get the British government to do—they completely disestablished and disendowed the church, and, as a good second (though in this our own Nonconformists are unfortunately not so unanimous), they abolished religious instruction in schools. Unhappily, these two good deeds were marred by conditions which robbed them of much of their virtue. I shall come to that presently. Only harsh and unsympathetic minds can fail to make allowance for the gigantic antagonisms which confronted the Bolsheviks when, in 1917, the second Revolution brought about the fall of the Provisional Government, the flight of Kerensky, and the first meeting of the Soviet. Have our Anti-Russian hot-heads forgotten that within a few months, actually during the summer of 1918, Lenin was laid low by a woman assassin, and for some days hovered between life and death, that counter-risings were occurring all over the country fomented in great part by the old Tzarist pristhood, that counter-revolutionary armies under "White" generals were being equipped and financed by French and British agencies, by whom also an inhuman blockade was established whereby food and even medicine and red-cross relief were prevented from entering Russia, entailing vast misery and starvation on the unhappy population for whom the Soviet government had now become responsible? If all the atrocious charges made by Anti-Russians against the Soviet regime were true, they would not in their horrid totality amount to a tithe of the suffering inflicted upon the non-combatant population of Russia by that inhuman blockade. Not to be softened by these remembrances is to display a heart of stone, or a dull imagination, or a blind political prejudice. The Soviet government never pretended to be pacifist, and those who are themselves not pacifist do ill to judge them by pacifist standards. Let them ask themselves what they would have done in such dire straits and faced by such combination of malicious antagonists.

Now I return to the Soviet contention that in a certain limited way religious freedom does exist under their rule. The recent testimony of visitors to and travellers in Russia proves beyond doubt that thousands of churches are open every day, and that priests and preachers continue to worship publicly, to celebrate sacraments, to preach and pray, without molestation. They are forbidden to give religious instruction to groups of young people under eighteen (though parents may instruct their children at home), and they are forbidden to add social or welfare work to their strictly religious activities. For the first of these prohibitions we can have nothing but condemnation. As for the second, it is not the case that the State, the Municipalities, and Public Charities have for long been more and more taking over from the church the care of the poor and the sick which was formerly a church monopoly? After all, it is a nation's business to care for its sick and poor. I can well understand that the churches do not relish losing the *kudos* which their charities brought them. But after all, this can hardly be described as persecution, though it may be a hardship. The remedies of protest and constitutional agitation are still open to the Russian church and people.

The Soviet government repudiates the charge of fighting religion "by the methods of the mediæval inquisition," and in simple justice that repudiation must be accepted. Counter-revolutionary activity under the disguise of religion is a different matter, and we must in all fairness leave that to be dealt with according to the laws of that country, as we do in the case of other countries. The Soviet frankly admits that it continues to "fight religion by education and propaganda." We may dislike the policy, but we have no right to elevate it into a *casus belli*. It is a matter for the Russian people. The age of religious wars has passed away. A Christian crusade against an Atheistical Russia would be as inglorious and as disastrous as were the old crusades against Theistical Islam.

We cannot deny the right of any community or people to be atheistic, and to pursue atheism with a sincerity and fervour which almost elevate it to the height of a religion. Nor can we deny the right of propaganda, though we denounce physical force or political coercion. And of necessity we disapprove of coercive methods of making other people stop coercing. If the imposition of atheism by force is bad, not less bad is the suppression of atheism by force. The only consistent person is the pacifist who objects to violence all round. He objects to atheism by compulsion, and equally to putting down atheism by compulsion. In the very hour when we are endeavoring to persuade the British government to abolish its existing laws against atheism,* we are invited by Christian crusaders to embark on an anti-Russian campaign which might easily reach such heights as to be written down in history as Europe's war to put down atheism. The thing is preposterous, and the more it is looked at the more ridiculous it becomes.

Personally, I dislike as much as most people some of the propaganda in which an atheistic Soviet indulges; as, for instance, the anti-religious museum and

*The reference is to old enactments commonly referred to as "The Blasphemy Laws."

Later Note. Parliament has refused to abolish them.

demolition of shrines of great historic or artistic value. But here again dare we assume a war-like attitude to Russia for doing in the twentieth century the sort of thing we ourselves did in the seventeenth? During that period we put our Quakers in the pillory and cropped their ears. It seems clear that the violent deaths alleged against the Soviet were deaths inflicted during the civil war to which I have already referred, and which were fully balanced by similar barbarities on the other side. That was nearly a dozen years ago. They cannot be brought forward as evidences of present-day religious martyrdoms. For this statement I shelter myself behind a careful and dispassionate article in this week's *New Leader* written by one whom I regard as an exceptionally just man and a conscientious writer, Mr. H. N. Brailsford.

But to come back to the matter of closing churches and breaking down shrines. It is clear that churches in Russia are not closed by compulsion, but either by the conversion to atheism of the communities in which they are located, or by the fact that there are more churches in the village or town than are required for public worship. We know what that is even in this island. This is not persecution, though it evidences some headway on the part of the Society of the Godless, which naturally magnifies these closures as evidences of successful propaganda. But level headed people are not to be misled by partizan brag on either side. Where churches are empty, or are superfluous owing to the number of churches in the district, it would seem to be the height of good sense to turn them into schools which are greatly needed, or libraries, or cottage hospitals, or village clubs, or to put them to some other socially beneficial use.

As for the demolition of shrines, I would ask: When was iconoclasm counted an unpardonable offence? When I was a boy, I was taught to applaud the action of the newly christianized Norse king, Olaf, in smashing the Druid idols with his mighty mace. And what about the English Puritans and Scots Covenanters who, with much smashing of images and Popish saints, dismantled the churches and abbeys of their time to the cry of: "Pull down the nests and the crows will fly away!" And what about the English king who violently broke up the monasteries, plundered their treasuries, and distributed their lands among his favorites? Do I endorse that kind of thing? Far from it. But I am not to endorse war upon the Russian people for no better reason than that in some matters they are where we ourselves were a century or two ago. Russia is like that. Its present government has set itself the herculean task of crowding the European development of several centuries into as many years. It may not be serving God according to orthodoxy, but it is tremendously convinced that it is serving Humanity. Since when did that become a crime? Let us be charitable. Let us be generous. Let us be just.

"Justice!" Aye, that brings to mind the miserable and sordid record of the Tzarist church which, mind you, to the Russian people and its government, stands for religion. I read that the anti-religious museum, which is appropriately housed in a monastery, includes among its exhibits a picture of an incident in the 1905 revolution—the picture of a machine gun planted on the belfry of a church spirting bullets into the crowds of people in the square beneath. Alongside the soldier who is manipulating the gun stands a priest blessing the machine which is reddening the street with the people's blood. That is no fancy picture. Can you expect people to believe in a religion like that? Compared with such a religion, in my opinion, intellectual atheism is the height of piety. All along the line the Holy Synod was consistently on the side of Tzarist terrorism, for which reason it must be credited with a considerable share in stimulating revolution. In addition, the ignorance,, superstititon, idleness avarice, and general depravity of the priesthood was notorious. It was ever the vile instrument of despotic Tzarism, the enemy of pure religion in whatever sect of Jews or Christians may have run counter to its low interests. During the famine of 1921, the government rightly laid hands on some of the church's vast treasures to feed the starving populace. There was bitter resentment and rebellion and counter-plotting. At that period may have occurred some of the executions and imprisonments now being brought forward as cases of present-day martyrdom and persecution. I have no hesitation in saying that any system of atheism that goes hand in hand with social justice is far better than a system of idolatrous image-worshipping, ignorant, grovelling, and reactionary superstition. I openly rejoice in the downfall of such a superstition (for religion I will not call it) whatever takes its place. Nothing could be worse. Nothing could be more injurious to the highest spiritual as well as material interests of any people. The Holy Synod has reaped only as it sowed. A pure heaven has avenged itself.

A certain religious journal, speculating on the future of religion in Russia, wondered whether religion might not be wholly exterminated in that country. Idle thought! You can no more extirpate religion from Russian hearts than you can take the sun out of Russian skies. Religion is the flowering of the spiritual in human nature, and will bloom without respect to its political environment. I do not deceive myself into imagining that the men who constitute the Soviet government desire the continuance of religion even in its most ideal form. They burn with iconoclastic zeal for more than the destruction of icons, grovelling priesthoods, and coarse other-worldliness. Lenin himself in his red-hot zeal for a mechanical, material this-world Utopia, would have uprooted idealistic philosophy itself along with religion its elder sister. There is no evidence that his successors have discarded either Lenin's principle or his policy. I think we do them no wrong when we credit them with a sincere and ardent desire to abolish spiritual idealism along with idealistic philosophy. The question is: Will their anti-religious propaganda accomplish its task? I think not. Needless to say: I hope not. I think they may be the instruments of a higher purpose and power than they reckon on, accomplishing a great and necessary work of destruction, clearing away superstitious rubbish, abolishing formalities and shams, purging the commonwealth of unendurable hypocrisies, as the Sivas and destroying angels of outworn fraud and humbug, or as the Heaven's Furies of the prophet Amos. Such workings are not uncommon in history. The builders and planters of vineyards will duly follow. The ideal religionists can no more be extirpated than can the musicians, poets, artists, nature-lovers, and glorious dreamers of whom great Russia has produced her full share, and will produce yet more. True religion considered as the ideal of humanity reaching forth to the Eternal future and up to the Infinite high cannot

be suppressed by any governmental propaganda or persecution whatever. The upas-tree of superstition may fall to the axe of the propagandist or the persecutor, but the Tree of Life, like the poet's Arbor Vitæ, will draw strength and virtue from its very wounds. Religion may change its form but it never dies. The smashing of idols may be a necessary prelude to the emergence of a purer faith of which Stundists, Dukhobors, and high-minded Jews have been the simple fore-runners, and Leo Tolstoy the Voice which cried in the wilderness. My hope is in such emancipated groups as—to take the best known—that which calls itself "The Living Church." I understand this to consist of modernist Christians who have accepted the Soviet Republic in good faith, and are working forward, making the best of prevailing conditions, utilizing all constitutional means of securing the removal of oppressive measures, and the widening of the bounds of freedom. No form of government lasts for ever. No laws are eternal. The Living Church has chosen a splendid name, suggestive of the Living God. It seems to me that the plotting politicians, or financiers, or commercials, or industrialists who are base enough to engineer a religious outcry for political and business ends never had a God to forget.

WALTER WALSH.

We Believe in Prayer

[These statements on the highly important question of prayer, now being so hotly debated, are taken from a book of the above title edited by our colleague, Dr. Sydney Strong, and soon to be published by Coward-McCann, New York. One hundred clergymen and laymen are contributors to this book. We are indebted to editor and publishers for permission to use these advance excerpts.—EDITOR.]

M. K. Gandhi, India

I have your letter for which I thank you. In answer to your question I can say in one sentence that prayer has given me peace. There is a verse we sing every day in the morning which means: "I seek not kingdom, nor paradise, nor even salvation; I seek only the deliverance from affliction of the afflicted."

Memchandra Sarkar, India

Prayer is the corner-stone of the religion of the Brahmo Samaj. The Bramo Samaj do not believe in a God who has created the universe and then rests in some corner of it, nor in a God who administers the creation according to some appointed laws. We believe in a living providence who knows our needs, listens to the cries of the heart, and fulfills our just and earnest prayer. Answer to prayer is as scientific as the fact that oxygen and hydrogen mixed in a certain proportion produce water. It is a fact of universal experience. Good and true men in all ages and climes have found solace and strength in prayer. It has been found that in some mysterious way the earnest prayers of the human heart are often, if not always, answered. It may not be possible to explain the philosophy of prayer; but it is an unquestionable fact of experience, and science and philosophy must take cognizance of it.

The fact that prayers are not always fulfilled does not affect the reality of prayer. Prayer like all natural events has its conditions. Prayer to be efficacious must fulfill these conditions. True prayer is not the idle man's device of getting his work done by God. Real prayer is the earnest resignation to the providence of God after one has done all he could. Prayer is not the words uttered by the lips, but an attitude of the mind. When a man after making utmost exertions looks up to God in helplessness for strength and guidance, that is true prayer. If such a prayer is not fulfilled we should understand that God has some better plans.

Chief Minister of The Sadharan Brahmo Samaj.

John Haynes Holmes,* Community Church, New York

I look at prayer from the humanistic rather than from the theological point of view. Prayer is not a dogma, but a practice; it is not an idea, but an experience. In its essence it means three things:

First, prayer is the deliberate formulation in our mind of the idea of something that we need or want. Our desires are always outrunning our attainments; we are always reaching for something beyond us and above us. When we formulate our desire in a clear statement of the mind, we are praying. Prayer from this point of view is the conscious, deliberate fixation of our inner attention upon the needs and aspirations of our lives.

Secondly, prayer is the deliberate direction of our life forces to the attainment of our desires. Prayer is attention unfolding into intention. It is the formulation and expression of purpose, resolution, dedication

Lastly, prayer is the identification of the intention of our lives with the larger intention, or purpose, of the universe. We are not alone, in other words, in our desires, as we are not alone in our existence. What we are, and what we want, we share with the cosmos. Thus we do not work alone, but may gather to our aid the forces akin to ourselves but so much greater than ourselves, that fill the world. Prayer, in its ultimate and highest meaning, is the conscious and deliberate attempt to gain contact with the universe, and thus to merge our lives with the life of the whole.

From beginning to end, prayer is an experience within ourselves. If it is directed to the attainment of ends beyond ourselves, this is only because "no man liveth unto himself." But the process of prayer is a human process. Our prayers are the expression, as their answer is the achievement, of our own lives. God helps us only when and as we help ourselves.

**Editor of* UNITY.

Zona Gale*

I believe in prayer, as I believe in the "practice of the presence of God." These are not different.

Prayer is not primarily to petition. It is becoming primarily acutely aware of the presence of God and it is the effort to become activated by that presence. It is not, "Be near me." It is, "Let me be aware of this continual nearness. Let me touch this energy, be open to it, be affected by it. Thus all that I do will tend to become energized by that power—not myself, which I recognize without knowing how to define."

Quite outside the area of mechanism—as we now know the machine of us—lies this area of awareness. It is unquestionably mechanistic in the same sense as are our mental and bodily processes—but we are not able as yet to chart the mechanics of the spirit. We do not know how we put ourselves into relation with influences which our minds do not detect. We cannot define that process, or describe how we receive its results. But it happens after prayer.

Aware of the interpretation given to all this by the behaviorists and others, we accept their interpretation so far as it goes. But beyond all that they offer, move results which are not explained by them. It may be that the Will to Believe literally produces—not belief, but the new mechanism by means of which this other functioning is carried on.

Certainly prayer produces results. By acute awareness of a spiritual order—or presence, if you prefer—the unknown "I" within one may tap a reservoir of power of which we know nothing. Perhaps the "I" within touches the intelligence without, momentarily becomes conscious of its identification with it and is empowered.

"What!" tadpole must have exclaimed to tadpole, "Do you mean that when you put your nose above water, there is actually something *else* than water to breathe? Absurd!"

**Member of* UNITY *Fellowship.*

Anna Garlin Spencer,* New York

I believe in Prayer; not as petition. Not as a system of spiritual control of the ultimate "powers that be" that have made and are making our human life. Not as any attempt to express in ceremonial form of words at stated times in public service of worship. Not as a part of creedal statement, or as an element in the formalization of philosophic thought. Not as the preservation of outgrown symbols of the religious life.

I believe in prayer as "the soul's sincere desire, uttered or unexpressed." I believe in prayer as the unfettered expression of the high moods of aspiration, of the deep affections, of the loneliness of defeat and the rapture of achievement, of the crisis-decisions of the personal life and of the ethical struggle toward perfection. In such moods and experiences the single person needs and must secure if possible a sense of universal companionship, a feeling "at one with whatsoever forces draw the ages on."

The Friends put it in this phrase, "Center down in the Quiet." Gannett expressed it in his admonition "now journey inward to thyself and listen by the way." The modern thinker gives permission for the sacred rite of the aspiring spirit when he says, "all high moods tend toward the personalization of the Infinite."

For this reason I believe in spoken prayer in the Church service; not as having a never-changing form of words. But rather the preservation, as in all great literature, for reading in united meditation, of those high affirmations of great souls when they have felt most sure of the Realties of our mysterious existence and most near to the Heart of Things.

We should have not only the courage of our convictions, but the courage of our emotions. No literalist should deprive us of the wings of the spirit on which we rise to assurance of Truth, of Right, of Love and of Beauty—that hath been, and are, and shall be forever more.

**Editorial Contributor of* UNITY.

Charles Strong,* Australian Church, Melbourne

Prayer, as I understand it, is the emotional expression (silent or vocal) of man's perception of relationship to the invisible beings that he believes surround him and influence his destiny, or to one great Being in Whom he "lives and moves and has his being."

There is evolution in the idea of prayer, according to the intellectual and spiritual level men and women may have reached in their conception of God and Man, and their relation to each other.

On the highest level, prayer is the willing throwing open of a human spirit's doors and windows, so to speak, and inviting God as the Spirit of Truth, Beauty, Love, to come and dwell in us and take possession of us: dedicating ourselves to the willing service of this God, as His sons and daughters, co-operators with Him in the evolution of humanity, including our own personalities. Hence *life* becomes a prayer.

Is not the highest prayer-ideal, whether private or social:—"Give, and it shall be given unto you"—"It is blessed rather to give than to receive?"

Such prayer thus always brings its own answer—even while the worshiper is yet speaking.

In such prayer, man rises above "nature," becomes conscious of his own dignity, and finds a deep bond of brotherhood, as Tennyson says,

> For so the whole round earth is every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

**Foreign Representative of* UNITY.

Stephen S. Wise, Free Synagogue, New York

The underlying assumption of prayer is not that things may be had for the asking, but that there are levels of life which cannot be reached save through superhuman communion. Prayer reaches a high state when it is recognized that prayer must never be directed against another or against another people nor even for things for self, or others, but solely for the inmost life of self, or the inmost life of another.

"Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him"—that is prayer, for it is love supreme, it is trust sublime. Is not his soul most truly served who, whether his petition be granted or denied, flings himself into the unknown with a song in his heart touching his fate: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him."

Prayer is not the only possible form of co-operation on the part of the human with the divine, and when prayer becomes a substitute for every other manner of aspiring co-operation with the divine purpose, then it becomes nothing more than utilitarian and

base trafficking. Prayer must in truth be nothing more than the will to co-operate with the Eternal Purpose become articulate.

Prayer is not proof of the soul's dependence, but a token of the soul's freedom. If prayer were merely the soul's asking, then prayer were dependence, but prayer is giving, hence token of the soul's freedom. Prayer is giving in the quest of that which is being; prayer is even more than the communion of the soul on the highest levels of life, for it is the affirmation of the soul's relation to infinite power, everlasting wisdom, illimitable love.

I pray not that I may have but that I may be: I pray not that God may give me, but that I may give myself to God, nor shall I cease to pray when God withholds from me, for from me God may not withhold the infinite and eternal gift of himself. Prayer is the joy, high and unutterable, of the soul's outreaching unto Him who is the soul of souls!

Peter Ainslie, Baltimore, Maryland

O Lord, we give ourselves to Thee and ask that Thou wouldst make us organs of Thy Spirit in gentleness, patience, and good-will. Open our eyes that we may see that Thou hast made us to be brothers one to another, and awaken within us alarm when we do violence to brotherhood by ugly attitudes and unbrotherly conduct. Guide us in the revaluation of the things of others and, at the same time, in the revaluation of our own things, in order that we may find a fair appreciation of those things that are appreciated. Help us to know that we cannot attain happiness when others are unhappy, nor brotherly love so long as Thy church is torn by strife. Lead us into a united Christendom. Purge us of vainglorying, bigotry, false witness-bearing, and ugliness of spirit. Bestow upon us honesty for our pretence, strength for our weakness, courage for our fear, faith for our wavering, and love for our indifference and suspicion. Thou art alive and the goodness of the world is the pulse beat of Thy life. Live Thou in us until every wrong shall be ashamed, and show us how to find satisfaction at Thy feet when we hear Thy word.—Amen.

John Howland Lathrop, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Prayer is religion's supreme poetic exercise. By it, the mind is quickened, the affections are released and the imagination is kindled. All that is highest and holiest, the sanctified lives of the past, those nearest and dearest both living and dead, the person one might be, the ideal society, are lifted up before the mind in the moment of prayer. The impossible in hours of weakness, becomes the possible and is vividly beheld as at hand. Under the spiritual excitement of true prayer there is an accession of strength which lifts the burden from the mind, dispels discouragement and gloom, sanctifies the joys of life or brings calmness and peace to the distraught. That there is an influx of power from sources beyond the individual when the flood gates of the spirit are thus thrown open to the true, the beautiful and the good, would seem to be the testimony of the experience of mankind with prayer. Prayer may, like all thought, be silent or spoken. It may be individual and alone, or individual while accompanied by some social expression; or it may be a communion of spirits in which the individual is lost in the common thought and feeling that rises in the company through suggestion.

Roger W. Babson, Economist

I know that, owing to our being free agents, it is necessary for us to relax and meditate often. Only by such meditating is it possible for us to keep in harmony with this Divine Force and hence benefit therefrom. The need of such meditation developed the custom of prayer; and the benefit referred to is commonly known as spiritual power.

Notwithstanding the needless superstitions which have crept into theology, the science of spiritual things, to ignore this spiritual power is pure ignorance. Hence, men pray and prayer has always been a source of great power. We, however, should pray that our efforts shall synchronize with natural laws rather than oppose them.

Prayer is something more than psychological. Prayer is putting oneself in a position where he receives divine spiritual power. In other words, although I believe in scientific prayer, yet I believe that prayer brings power from the outside as well as generates power within one's soul.

Margaret Deland, Author

The way I feel about prayer somehow seems to fall into philosophical, instead of mystical, language; —and most people would not be interested in an assertion that my belief in prayer is founded upon the assumption that the "I" is that part of God which experiences the Universe in the "I" environment. The "I's" consciousness of its oneness with God is, for me, prayer. Perhaps such consciousness in all the "I's", would save the world.

Mary E. Woolley, President, Mount Holyoke

A belief in prayer seems to me to be inevitable if one believes in God. And a belief in God is inevitable unless there is a frank denial of all except the material in life.

The Heart of Music

Through lonely dusk I came acreep
From off the desert trail;
I asked the Law to let me sleep
That night within the jail;
The hinges groaned, the lock reshut;
And there I heard a wail.

Across the stone, from wall to wall,
A bunch of Mexes paced;
Their voices rang the dingy hall,
Through time's oppressive waste,
With yearning songs of Mexico,
Of millions peon-faced.

One fellow took to higher pitch;
They climbed the walls of soul,
Up jagged sorrow, niche by niche,
Toward freedom's lighted goal;
They dropped—to wailings of despair
Down in the darksome hole.

They tried again, oh ever doomed,
Their only joy to try:
The Heart of Music thus entombed
Knows not how to die;
Canaries warble from the coops
To freedom and the sky.

H. H. Lewis.

Trumpets on New Horizons

They Who Labor

Who are these coming down our streets
So aloof, remote from city throngs?
Of the earth they are and elemental;
Women with faces sunburned as the soil;
Stoop-shouldered men with weary, bearded faces,
And tired, hot children clinging to their hands,
Like wisps of weathered wheat.

I see you coming, children of the fields,
Walking irresolutely, ill at ease.
What makes you seem out of place, O Children?
You choose your way with feet that hesitate,
Within your face there is a diffidence;
The streets apall you and your eyes complain.
The White-Way shaking out its golden signs
Of jeweled light startles you!
The screaming whistle and harsh throb
Of man-made things cause your hearts to dread.
Because of great hearts humbled and cast down
I love you, O shy Children.

With unwavering eyes direct as sunlight,
With bare arms tanned like meat of golden melons
You need not fear to stand and face the world!
You, with denim shoulders and work-widened hands,
Driving in with your brown bride—
Old farm mothers of wind-withered faces,
Faded flowers of kindness,
Tell them, the white ones—frail gardenias—
Tell them about *your* world and where you dwell.

Tell them how hot the sun on tortured heads
Which still look bravely up, in hope, to God;
How corn grows leapingly, and overnight
The silken cotton springs and turns to snow.
Tell them of star and moon and sun-wrought soil;
And then return, O brown ones, O shy Children,
To sit, at night, within the dream-locked twilight
Your babes about you—and your hearts content!

ENID HAYWARD

High Hat Gods

The high hat gods go down the aisles
Grinning at men their smirky smiles
Lifting their noses high in the air.
(And Mother Mary bending there!
Mother Mary with a stove pipe hat;
Angels in frock coats, imagine that.)

They number the dusty, musty pews
And collect ecclesiastical dues.
They build a house and close its gate
Where Lazarus and others wait
For silver thrown from the limousine,
And beggars cry, Unclean! Unclean!

Those gods can't live out in the snow
Where silly people come and go.
But there is one whose garment hem
Men want to touch; he stands with them
With only one low word to say
After the gods have gone their way.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY

Spring

Smith and Jones met on a spring morning
when life was flooding—
trees all green lace,
bird-song everywhere,
the sky a mingling
of opal haze and bright blue,
the little tongues of the new grass
caroling faintly to the drifting air—
the morning of mornings
that comes once a year.

The spell of spring was over them,
and though they were rivals—
manufacturers of electric chairs—
Smith said to Jones
and Jones said to Smith
heartily:
How's business?

GRANVILLE TRACE

The Study Table

The Quest of the Ages

Now and again in the flood of books there appears one which signalizes a dramatic event. Mr. Haydon's study of religion is of this type. Since the opening of the century, and especially since the conclusion of the Great War, traditional religion has been on the defensive. But though the circumstances of life and the advance of knowledge have combined to undermine its authority, the impulse to give life high meaning has persisted through the failure of traditional religion to function as its vehicle. In the last decade or two much readjustment of doctrine has been in process to meet this situation. For the most part, however, the chief motive has been to save as much as possible to religion's investment in dogma. Those who, for good or ill, have aimed to make a thorough job of redefinition have been very few in number. So far they have produced only the beginnings of a literature calculated to win the mind and heart of the layman. It is to the support of this group of liberals that Mr. Haydon has come with his straight-forward book.

According to the vast majority of people, religion is inseparable from some sort of supernaturalism. H. L. Mencken, in his recent *Treatise on the Gods*,* takes this view, and, doing so, shows once more how universal this conception has become. Religion, he asserts, is quite simple at bottom. Contrary to what is sometimes believed, "There is really nothing secret or complex about it, no matter what its professors may allege to the contrary." Wherever religion shows itself, he tells us, it has just one common character, and nothing else is essential. And this "single function is to give man access to the powers which seem to control his destiny" and "to induce these powers to be friendly to him." From the setting in which this analysis occurs the reader gathers that these powers are assumed to be gods, so that the essential thing about religion is its god-reference, its supernatural implications.

It is an old theory, this, and may possibly be true, but it is precisely this way of looking upon religion which Mr. Haydon combats. The close relationship between religion and God or gods, he argues, is something that may happen to a religion, not something original with it. In other words, religion is a broader term, covers more than man's attitude toward what he believes to be the divine powers which have his destiny in hand.

*Harper Brothers, pp. 1-IX; 243.

What then is religion? It is, says Mr. Haydon, "the shared quest for the values of a satisfying life." Man had long been devoted to this quest when the conception of the gods first dawned on his mind. And when he did think of gods, when he plead with them or tried to coerce them to help him, they were companionable citizens of the world he himself inhabited. It was only after man had come to think of himself as possessed of a spirit that the gods become such; and only after he had lost hope of attaining a satisfactory life on earth that the objectives of religion became transcendental. In some religions this transformation has never taken place. They have remained, as they began, cooperative ventures in the search for the good life on earth and with no supersensible admixture. Mr. Haydon's book is designed to familiarize the reader with this theory of religion; to lead him to detect its features through the theological veils of past and present creeds. "The urge to the good life," he holds, "is more fundamental than any of its traditional, religious embodiments, and religion, as a program for the amelioration of the ills of society that life may be lifted to nobler forms, has a chance to win, however conservatively intrenched may be the existing structure of religion."

The study of the problem is carried through nine chapters. They discuss theories of the universe and their place in religious formulations; the nature of gods, old and new, and the changes that have overtaken them; the problem of evil; the contrast between ancient and modern religious authority; the practical program of religion, etc. Throughout the book the author shows the effect of mature meditation upon the central theme, and he is obviously ruled by a sense of workmanship which is scholarly without being in the least pedantic. And nothing is clearer than his sympathetic understanding of the struggles of men to make their life liveable and worthy.

Perhaps it might be said that two notes predominate in Mr. Haydon's conception of religion for the modern world; the driving force which pushes man on in search of satisfaction and the achievements of science which man may employ to help him forward. The opportunity of religion grows out of the need for relating these two. Religions of the past have aspired, and mightily. Why did they fail? "The thing needed and lacking," replies Mr. Haydon, "was an intelligent method of selecting specific goals and formulating the power of realization." Science, he thinks, now makes this possible. Science provides the necessary knowledge and the necessary means for moving forward toward the goal. The task of religion is to take the various ends made visible by science and to unite them into a synthetic picture of the finest possible manner of life. "There has been," says Mr. Haydon, "no unified social vision to set the stakes for the use of the new mechanical and natural sciences." The demand which the present makes on religion is to do just this.

Naturally, *The Quest of the Ages* is a provocative book. No doubt many readers will find it impossible to accept the author's definition of religion, and many more will want to know what it comes to in specific devotions and behavior. And to say nothing of the great difficulty of achieving the unified vision demanded, some persons will not be satisfied to sum up the highest form of aspirational life in terms of social amelioration; they will want a man's religion to imply a sense of personal isolation and they will want man's attitude toward the world to include something more than a feeling of at-homeness. Life at its best is more than concern for meat and raiment and physical comfort either for oneself or for others. One of the obligations long associated with religion has been the effort to safeguard and further the qualities of personality which are the outgrowth of these subtler responses. And so one might go on. But one comes back to the author's purpose to present a survey of the religious quest in its world wide scope, its historical perspective, and its future promise as conceived by those of the new humanistic persuasion. And this job is done with distinction.

M. C. Otto.

Correspondence

The Swift Changing Scene in Russia

Editor of Unity:

A few moments ago I received a cable from my daughter, Anna Louise, dated March 4, 1930, saying "Unity article on 'The Fighting Farmers of Russia'* is ancient. Collections quintupled since then, completely controlling situation."

Will you insert this statement in Unity? It shows the rapidity with which things in Russia are moving.

Sydney Strong.

New York City.

* Printed in Unity in issue of February 24th last.—Editor.

A Correction

Editor of Unity:

A curious misprint crept into my recent letter on "India's Wrongs." I said "The British were individualists, and did not approve of communal lands." This was made to read, "The British were fundamentalists."

Alice Stone Blackwell.

Dorchester, Mass.

A Tour to Russia

Editor of Unity:

The readers of Unity will doubtless be interested in the announcement of the INTELLIGENT STUDENT'S TOUR OF SOCIALISM which is being planned for this summer by the League for Industrial Democracy, in cooperation with the Open Road, Inc., under the leadership of Dr. and Mrs. Harry W. Laidler. The group will be limited to fifteen. It will leave America on Saturday, June 28, on the S. S. Bremen, will visit London, Leningrad (via the Kiel Canal to Helsinfors), Moscow, Berlin, Vienna, Zurich, Geneva and Paris and return to the United States August 23. In various centers the party will interview men and women in the labor, socialist and communist movement and visit—to the extent that time permits—some of the more important cooperative, trade union and labor party institutions. Nor will the recreational side be overlooked.

Tens of thousands of students each year travel to Great Britain and the continent to study the culture of the past. Here is an opportunity to examine—even though briefly—the growing aspirations and accomplishments of those bent on building the social order of the future. The estimated cost of the trip is $787. Those interested might communi-

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

FRIENDSHIP EXHIBITS FROM MEXICAN CHILDREN

An exhibit of Mexican art work, prepared by the pupils in industrial schools of Mexico as an expression of their friendship for the children of the United States, was presented to the Committee on World Friendship among Children March 1. The ceremony took place at the Museum of Natural History, in New York. The presentation was made by Senor Fernando Legarde, of the Mexican Embassy in Washington. The exhibit was received by Mrs. Jeanette W. Emrich, Secretary of the Committee on World Friendship Among Children, of the Federal Council of Churches. Jerome Hess, Vice-President of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, also participated in the presentation. The presence of groups of Mexican children and also of Mexican students from colleges and universities in New York made the occasion colorful.

There are forty-nine separate cases of children's art materials and of the products of expert workers in lacquer and pottery, one case being destined for each state of the Union and one for the District of Columbia.

YOUTH IN "WORLD PEACE" PRIZE COMPETITION

Mrs. Anna F. G. VanLoan, of Babylon, N. Y., has established a Goodwill Foundation, in loving memory of her husband, Zelah Joy VanLoan, the income from this to be administered by the Committee on World Friendship Among Young People, under the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for promoting the spirit of friendship and understanding among the youth of the world.

The projects sponsored by the Foundation will be in the nature of Prize Essay Contests. "The Church and World Peace"—first theme competition to end on January 15, 1931. Prizes to be awarded World Goodwill Day, May 18, 1931.

Five $200 prizes are offered, one for each winning essay from the following territorial divisions: (1) United States and Canada (2) Mexico, Central and South America (3) Europe (4) Near East (5) Far East. A $500 grand prize will be awarded to the best of these five winning essays.

Any young person between the ages of 14 and 19 is eligible to enter this contest. The essays shall not exceed 1,500 words in length. These essays must be in the hands of the committee on or before January 15, 1931.

For further information, rules and suggestions, write: The Committee on World Friendship Among Young People, 105 East 22nd St., New York.

RUSSIAN PERSECUTION

First, it is a fact, a very serious fact. Second, it has been going on for 12 years. Third, as it has accomplished its purpose, it has become increasingly severe. Fourth, the purpose is complete eradication of organized religion, and establishment of atheism as the philosophy of life. Fifth, the religion of the Orthodox Church of Russia is not a very useful religion anyway. Sixth, the atheist government is seeking a social goal that religious countries may well investigate. Seventh, Days of Prayer for the Persecuted are regarded over there as veiled threats and political propaganda. Eighth, U. S. S. R. does not discriminate much between religions—Orthodox, Evangelical, Mohammedan, Jewish—are all alike to them. Ninth, two things we can do; Pray for Russia (without talking about it), and learn the lesson of what happens (always has happened) to an unfaithful church. Tenth, ask how faithful is the American Church.

Federation Bulletin (Rochester, N. Y.)

THE CHURCH IN THE CHANGING CITY

"It is coming to be the common conviction of Protestantism that no denomination is justified in maintaining a separate existence whose primary issue with the whole church is dead, or whose chief spiritual values have already passed across its borders into the larger life of the church.

"If Protestantism is to exercise again its original central and directing function in the whole vast work of creating and sustaining a Christian civilization, it first must put its own house in order."

From the Detroit Conference.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST DRINK IN INDIA

If religious bodies and trustees of public institutions for the moral and spiritual welfare of Hindus cannot make up their minds to use the cocoanut trees in their charge in the right way instead of allowing them to be tapped for toddy, little impression can be made on private owners of cocoanut trees. Vested interests are powerful impediments in the way of inducing a change in Government policy. The Government liquor traffic has brought into extreme vogue the practice of leasing cocoanut trees for toddy instead of taking the natural product in fruit. The increase of agricultural indebtedness has assisted this process. The liquor licensee gives in advance for the toddy, once in six months, a good lump sum which comes in very handy to the tree owners, and further relieves them from the worry involved in rearing, guarding and marketing the fruit. Immediate cash tempts them, and they so to say draw from the capital of their trees, which are allowed to be permanently and seriously injured in fruit-bearing capacity and in length of life. A reversion to the right use of cocoanut trees will, apart from the question of prohibition, give to the people cheap cocoanut,

---

cate with the League for Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19th Street, New York City, or the Open Road, Inc.

New York City

NORMAN THOMAS

Executive Director, League of Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19th Street.

Cooperation for Security

Editor of UNITY:

The mournful impasse at the London parley commands us to consider first principles. Norman Angell's book, "The Dangers of Half Preparedness," emphasizes the fact that all military preparedness must depend on policy. One policy of a nation may require ten times the force that another policy would. Is not our cardinal mistake the focusing of thought on parity of tonnage instead of on parity of security, and reduction of armaments? With a superabundance of assets for security over that of any other nation, we are spending more money than any other on defence and our delegates at London have ignored these assets by demanding parity of tonnage. The protection of an ocean on each side of us is equal for protection to the strongest fleet. How startling and amazing is the spectacle of five nations that twelve years ago were allies now facing each other as if they had not sworn to seek only pacific means of settlement of every dispute, and figuring how many guns and ships each must have to protect itself against the other four! These five have 90 per cent of the navies of the world and are the only ones to be considered.

What is decided on in the next few weeks will profoundly affect the history of the world. The refusal of our delegates to make a special agreement with France for participation in consultation with the powers, if war threatened her, need not deter us from broader action. When M. Briand proposed to form a treaty with us for renunciation of war, our government wisely enlarged the proposal to include all nations. M. Briand agreed and 57 nations followed suit. Practical international statesmen have seen clearly that the Kellogg Pact requires specific provision for its application in any exigency. Both Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hoover believe in the principle of consultation. Mr. Stimson recognized in the Russo-Chinese imbroglio in consultation with other important signatories of the Kellogg Pact that the pact required this specific strengthening; and he began conversations with the French ambassador concerning adding to the pact provisions for general consultation in cases of dispute and danger. This provision was made by the Pacific powers at the Washington Conference in 1922; and the United States is a party to other similar commitments for consultation. It would certainly see, if we scruple at an exclusive commitment with France, as if a universal declaration might meet the immediate problem in the future. The world would eagerly welcome such a declaration which might be by the President as in the case of the Monroe Doctrine; and all the powers represented at London would endorse it.

LUCIA AMES MEAD

Boston, Mass.

which is one of the most valuable foodstuffs that nature has provided for man in India, but which now is sacrificed in order to produce what is positively injurious to the country.

The Madras Religious Endowments Board has taken a very important step in this matter. It is a body with statutory powers in regard to the management and supervision of temples in the province of Madras. It has issued the following memorandum dated 30th September, 1929, to all the Temple Committees within its jurisdiction:

"It has been brought to the notice of the Board, that cocoanut trees belonging to several religious institutions coming under the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 11 of 1927, are leased out for toddy drawing. The Board considers it quite inappropriate that in the name of the deities considered sacred by the worshipping public such things as are not conducive to the welfare of the public but are detrimental to their material, intellectual, moral and spiritual progress should continue to be done. Further, the Board is advised, that on the whole the letting out of cocoanut trees for toddy would prove injurious in the long run to the trees themselves even apart from humanitarian or other considerations.

"The Board is aware, that in some cases the incomes of temples might be considerably affected at present by the carrying out of the above instructions. In such cases, the trustees would do well to appeal to the public for pecuniary relief and to introduce some retrenchments in expenditure rather than continue the practice of leasing out cocoanut topes for toddy-drawing."

It is hoped that the trustees of temples will carry out the Board's advice without hesitation, though it is a pity that instructions were not issued earlier, as the toddy year begins on 1st October.

The Tanjore Temple Committee did well in adopting a resolution in good time not to lease any of its cocoanut trees for toddy even before the memorandum.

The president and members of the Taluk Board of Mannargudi also deserve to be congratulated on the following resolution which they have unanimously adopted:

"This Taluk Board is of the opinion, that in order to free the country from the evils consequent on the growing consumption of intoxicating drinks, it is necessary that all liquor shops should be closed, and in view of the fact that the vast majority of the people of this Taluk are anxious to get rid of the drink evil at once, this Taluk Board requests the Government to order the closing of all liquor shops within this Taluk. This Board also offers its services in every respect to enforce all laws and orders passed to secure total prohibition and prevent illicit traffic."

Other local bodies ought to follow this excellent lead of the Mannargudi Board.

The Taluk Boards of Ramachandrapuram (East Godavari) and Bhimavaram (West Godavari) too are worthy of praise in that they did not permit the location of liquor shops in the lands vested in them, and these Boards as well as the Nellore District Board in that they refused to allow their trees to be tapped for toddy.

—*C. R. in Young India.*

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
EDWIN CORNELL ZAVITZ, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

MARCH

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

Schumann & Co.
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue